

Objective 2

Governing Justly and Democratically

2.1 Rule of Law and Human Rights

Indicator	2.1-6 Averaged score for “access to civil Justice” and “Effective Criminal Justice” factors from the World Justice Project Rule of Law Index
Definition	Justice sector institutions and actors, both public and private, governmental and non-governmental, make up the other component of the justice sector and the arena in which Rule of Law programs take place. The World Justice Project Index takes into account the following factors when looking at access to justice: • People are aware of available remedies; • People can access and afford legal advice and representation; • People can access and afford civil courts; • Civil justice is free of discrimination; • Civil justice is free of corruption; • Civil justice is free of improper government influence; • Civil justice is not subject to unreasonable delays.; • Civil justice is effectively enforced; • ADR systems are accessible, impartial, and effective; • Crimes are effectively investigated; • Crimes are effectively and timely adjudicated; • The correctional system is effective in reducing criminal behavior; • The criminal justice system is impartial; • The criminal justice system is free of corruption; • The criminal justice system is free of improper government influence; • The criminal justice system accords the accused due process of law: • Informal justice is timely and effective; • Informal justice is impartial and free of improper influence; • Informal justice respects and protects fundamental rights. This indicator is the average of factor 7 “Access to Civil Justice” and Factor 8 “Effective Criminal Justice” (of a total of 8 Rule of Law factors) in the index.
Linkage to Long-Term Outcome or Impact	Access to justice is concerned with whether the population can adequately access the judicial or quasi-judicial systems that have been created. It includes access to civil and criminal justice and to informal justice systems. Without some measure of access to justice it is impossible to tell whether existing judicial systems are actually improving justice services in practice, and thus enhancing the rule of law and human rights observance in practice.
Indicator Type	Outcome
Unit of Measure	Measured by a numerical score between 0-1, with 1 being the best and 0 being the worst. Improvements in access to justice (the composite of World Justice Project Rule of Law Index factors 7-8) are indicated by a higher score over time or a score greater than .5.

Use of Indicator	Improving the composite of indicators 7 and 8 suggests positive impact and may reinforce USG direction and assumptions. Negative indicators suggests country backsliding. Changes in status may indicate a need to reassess USG program interventions. Indicator useful in program planning to identify possible programming and allocation of resources.
Data Source and Reporting Frequency	World Justice Project; annual; http://www.worldjusticeproject.org/rule-of-law-index/
Known Data Limitations	Only covers three major cities in each country, so may not accurately reflect access to justice in rural areas. The data provided to measure informal justice systems is limited because of the difficulty in measuring fairness and effectiveness in a systematic and comparable manner across countries. Not all countries are represented in the index. The 2011 index covers 66 countries. By averaging a number of variables the indicator may fail to reflect improvements in some areas and declines in others. Indicator is a broad measure that may demonstrate contribution rather than direct attribution to USG programming and funding, as many other factors may influence access to justice at these levels. One year preparation time means data for current year is not available until the following year.
Baseline Timeframe	2011
Disaggregate(s)	Criminal and civil

Indicator	2.1-7 Composite of “Physical Integrity Rights Index” and “New Empowerment Index” scores from the Cingranelli and Richards (CIRI) Human Rights Dataset [Index]
Definition	Physical integrity rights cover four rights not to be tortured, summarily executed, disappeared, or imprisoned for political beliefs. The New Empowerment Index covers civil liberties such as free speech, freedom of association and assembly, freedom of movement, freedom of religion, and the right to participate in the selection of government leaders.
Linkage to Long-Term Outcome or Impact	The composite of the two indices indicates a measure of compliance with internationally recognized civil and political rights, such as those described in the UN Convention on Civil and Political Rights and the UN Declaration on Human Rights. The index is only concerned with the practices of governments, not policies. This is a broad indicator of government compliance with internationally recognized civil and political rights. In countries receiving substantial USG assistance expectations would be an improvement in civil and political rights overtime, or maintenance of a particular level in an environment characterized by negative influences.
Indicator Type	Outcome
Unit of Measure	Physical Integrity Rights Index: This is an additive index constructed from the Torture, Extrajudicial Killing, Political Imprisonment, and Disappearance indicators. It ranges from 0 (no government respect for these four rights) to 8 (full government respect for these four rights). Empowerment Rights Index: This is an additive index constructed from the Foreign Movement, Domestic Movement, Freedom of Speech, Freedom of Assembly & Association, Workers’ Rights, Electoral Self-Determination, and Freedom of Religion indicators. It ranges from 0 (no government respect for these seven rights) to 14 (full government respect for these seven rights). A composite of the two scores are averaged based on the underlying sub-factors (different rights) in the index.
Use of Indicator	Improving indicator suggests positive impact and may reinforce USG program direction and assumptions. Negative indicators suggests country backsliding. Changes in status may indicate a need to reassess USG program interventions. A significant improvement in a country’s civil and political rights may indicate that assistance in this area is no longer required. Congress can use improvements in ranking in countries receiving USG assistance as a broad indicator of the impact of USG human rights assistance. The indicator may also be used in program planning to determine specific human rights programming in areas where the country has ranked particularly low or high as to the type of programming needs.
Data Source and Reporting Frequency	CIRI Human Rights Data Project’s New Empowerment Index is based on State Dept. Annual Reports. CIRI’s data in the Physical Integrity Index is gathered from the State Department Annual Reports and secondary data gathered from Amnesty International’s annual reports. If there are

	discrepancies between the two sources, CIRI instructs coders to treat the Amnesty International evaluation as authoritative, as to eliminate bias towards the U.S. and its allies.
Known Data Limitations	Data originates from internal USG sources rather than third party and therefore its objectivity could be questioned. The data set is broad and therefore difficult to attribute change to USG programming, as many other factors can attribute to human rights development at this level. Country year data also means that data may not be available for the present time period.
Baseline Timeframe	Baseline needs to be established; however, the indices may have baseline data for specific countries. The Cingranelli-Richards Human Rights Dataset (CIRI) Index uses country-year. CIRI's unit of analysis is the "country-year." A country-year is a particular country in a particular year. For instance, "United States 1998" is a particular country-year. It is a single snapshot of space and time -- one country in a particular year.
Disaggregate(s)	Sex and vulnerable groups (based on specific country data provided by Amnesty International Annual Reports)

2.1.1- Constitutions, Laws and Legal Systems

Indicator	2.1.1-1 Constitution incorporating fundamental freedoms drafted or amended with USG assistance
Definition	Fundamental freedoms include religion, peaceful assembly, association and expression, rights to physical integrity, and protection against discrimination on grounds of race, ethnicity, religion, gender, nationality, politics, sexual orientation, physical ability, health status, gender identity, gender expression or other status. In order to make this indicator a meaningful measure, operating units should qualify this indicator in their narrative, (i.e., by noting how long such a constitution has been in place, whether jurisprudence is flowing from it, whether amendments passed undermine or align with international standards, etc.) based on the country, or operating context. International standards include, but are not limited to: relevant international, regional and domestic treaties, instruments, agreements, and international, regional, and domestic human rights case law, UN or regional commission decisions and international customary law (including standards addressing the rights of women and girls and vulnerable populations). Operating Units should identify which international standards are applicable.
Linkage to Long-Term Outcome or Impact	The constitution is the fundamental document, backed up by the state, and protected by law, on which democracy is based. Although the constitution alone does not guarantee freedoms, it does indicate a serious level of public commitment and sets a standard for government to follow.
Indicator Type	Outcome
Unit of Measure	Yes/No
Use of Indicator	USAID Missions can use this indicator in planning to determine possible programming which may further the implementation of rights based on the country's constitution. A lack of rights may indicate the need for further assistance in certain areas. This indicator measures effort. In countries receiving USG assistance for constitution drafting expectations would be an improvement in the human rights framework within the constitution which can increase the commitment of a government to implement human rights protections resulting in a higher respect for human rights and decreased human rights violations over time.
Data Source and Reporting Frequency	Annual review of project/program documents, official government journals, news media, USAID Missions DG offices – public gazettes or public registers, relevant legislative committees, or civil society organizations tracking these issues.
Known Data Limitations	This indicator on its own is binary and will not likely change much over time because constitution drafting does not often occur on a regular basis. Amendments to the constitution may be added more frequently than the original drafting, but this also may not happen frequently in a given time period. In some countries, constitutions, constitutional amendments and laws from these are not public documents and so a qualitative analysis could be difficult as the data could be difficult to obtain.

Baseline Timeframe	This is an existing indicator, so the baseline will be the year the country began collecting this data.
Disaggregate(s)	None

Indicator	2.1.1-5 Number of laws or constitutional amendments that protect fundamental freedoms and are consistent with international human rights standards adopted with USG support
Definition	Laws and constitutional amendments, to which a country has acceded, provide general parameters under which a country establishes its constitution and subsidiary legal framework. A legal framework is the set of laws legally promulgated under the procedures established by a country's constitution, legislation by national legislatures pertaining to the protection of fundamental freedoms. International human rights standards include, but are not limited to: relevant international, regional and domestic treaties, instruments, agreements, and international, regional, and domestic human rights case law, UN or regional commission decisions and international customary law (including standards addressing the rights of women and girls and vulnerable populations). Operating Units should identify which international human rights standards are applicable. If there is a stand-alone rule of law program that focuses on regulatory outcomes, operating unit is highly encouraged to submit custom indicators that capture data on new regulations passed or implemented.
Linkage to Long-Term Outcome or Impact	Laws create the rules that direct the delivery of governance, essential services, justice, as well as the desired relationship between citizens and the government, including the use of legal force. These laws define economic and relevant political relationships and lay the groundwork for development progress in all areas of assistance. The absence of a clear human rights-compliant legal framework normally indicates a repressive regime, and could precipitate political instability and/or a deterioration of economic conditions. This indicator demonstrates USG support for improving a country's legal framework for protecting fundamental freedoms consistent with relevant international human rights standards. The indicator does not measure the quality of legislation or implementation, but suggests improvements in the protection of human rights by providing a legal framework to enforce fundamental rights. Improving the legal framework suggests a willingness to protect human rights and it can contribute to implementing and enforcing the protection of those rights.
Indicator Type	Outcome
Unit of Measure	Number of laws
Use of Indicator	Indicates level of effort by the USG and the host-country government. Indicator can be used in program-planning and analysis to determine current legal environment with regards to the protection of human rights.
Data Source and Reporting Frequency	Annual review of project/program documents, official government journals and documents, public gazettes or public registers, relevant legislative committees and records, news media, USAID Missions, implementing partners, State Department annual human rights reports, or civil society organizations and international organizations and NGOs tracking these issues, such as, UN High Commissions for Human Rights, Human Rights Watch, and Amnesty International.

Known Data Limitations	Definitions of international human rights standards are fairly broad. Depending on the country/region, information from all sources might not be available; therefore, information gathering may be inconsistent from Mission to Mission/region to region. Legal frameworks are a critical step in a longer process to create the environment for the delivery of services, economic growth and justice, but the data does not capture the actual implementation of that framework which is key to achieving the rule of law.
Baseline Timeframe	2011 or 2012, as this is a new indicator
Disaggregate(s)	N/A

Indicator	2.1.1-6 Number of laws, regulations, amendments or provisions that would violate fundamental freedoms or international human rights standards as proposed but whose offending provisions were defeated with USG support
Definition	International human rights standards, to which a country has acceded, provide general parameters under which a country establishes its constitution and subsidiary legal framework. A legal framework is the set of laws legally promulgated under the procedures established by a country's constitution. International human rights standards include, but are not limited to: relevant international, regional and domestic treaties, instruments, agreements, and international, regional, and domestic human rights case law, UN or regional commission decisions and international customary law (including standards addressing the rights of women and girls and vulnerable populations). Operating Units should identify which international human rights standards are applicable. Operating units should qualify in their indicator narratives, the scope, scale and impact of any laws impacted (e.g., only 2 of 100 laws were changed because they were most critical for foreign policy interests or USG programmatic considerations).
Linkage to Long-Term Outcome or Impact	While laws compliant with international human rights standards can show adherence to, or movement towards, increased rule of law and human rights observance, USG effectiveness may be shown also by defeat or avoidance of laws that move away from those outcomes when these are introduced as draft laws or regulations.
Indicator Type	Output
Unit of Measure	Number of laws with offending provisions modified to eliminate non-compliance to international human rights standards. And/or the number of proposed laws that would violate fundamental freedoms or international human rights standards that are defeated.
Use of Indicator	Indicates level of effort by the USG and the host-country government. Indicator can be used in program-planning and analysis to determine current legal environment with regards to the protection of human rights.
Data Source and Reporting Frequency	Annual review of project/program documents, official government journals and documents, public gazettes or public registers, relevant legislative committees, news media, USAID Missions, implementing partners, State Department annual human rights reports, or civil society organizations and international organizations and NGOs tracking these issues, such as, UN High Commissions for Human Rights, Human Rights Watch, and Amnesty International.
Known Data Limitations	The USG may have limited access to or influence on negotiations regarding specific laws. The causal linkage could be speculative as USG influence may not be uniquely responsible for changes in provisions.
Baseline Timeframe	2011 or 2012 as this is a new indicator
Disaggregate(s)	n/a

Indicator	2.1.1-4 Number of USG-supported public sessions held regarding proposed changes to the country's legal framework
Definition	Public sessions refer to hearings, town hall meetings & debates held regarding proposed changes to the legal framework (i.e. draft laws, amendments to laws, constitutions, etc.). Operating Units must define the scope of public sessions (duration, scale/attendance) in their PMP data reference sheet and in the PPR indicator narrative.
Linkage to Long-Term Outcome or Impact	This indicator measures one aspect of programs designed to develop democratically-derived constitutions and legal and regulatory frameworks through participatory processes. USG support for public sessions helps develop consensus-building, transparency, and/or legitimate processes which will increase the likelihood that such processes will end in agreement.
Indicator Type	Output
Unit of Measure	Number of public sessions
Use of Indicator	The State Department and the USAID Missions can use this indicator for program planning to indicate the level of effort and evaluate existing or future programming. An increase in the number of public sessions regarding changes to a country's legal framework suggests that USG assistance is building an increasingly democratic and consensus-building culture. It also increases the likelihood that when the legal framework is put in place implementation of that framework will occur because a variety of groups came together in the public sessions to openly discuss the legal framework.
Data Source and Reporting Frequency	Annual review of project/program documents, official government journals, news media, and observation by USG officials, including State Dept. political offices and USAID missions DG offices.
Known Data Limitations	Public sessions could involve minimal participation or could exclude certain groups. This indicator is also very process-oriented and does not indicate success/relevance of conclusions drawn from these sessions, i.e. whether they are linked to the legal development process.
Baseline Timeframe	This is an existing indicator, so the baseline will be the year the country began collecting this data.
Disaggregate(s)	Sex; age; indigenous or tribal peoples; rural/urban where relevant

2.1.2 – Judicial Independence

Indicator	2.1.2-6 Independence of Judiciary in Cingranelli and Richards (CIRI) Human Rights Dataset [Index]
Definition	This variable indicates the extent to which the judiciary is independent of control from other sources, such as another branch of the government or the military. Judicial independence is generally used to mean that both the institution of the judiciary and individual judges are free from interference by other institutions and individuals.
Linkage to Long-Term Outcome or Impact	The rule of law depends on a separation of governmental powers among branches and levels of government. Independence of the Judiciary is seen as an important check on the other branches of government.
Indicator Type	Outcome
Unit of Measure	Numerical score on scale of 0-2. A score of 0 indicates "not independent", a score of 1 indicates "partially independent" and a score of 2 indicates "generally independent".
Use of Indicator	Improving indicator suggests positive impact and may reinforce USG program direction and assumptions. Negative indicators suggests country backsliding. Changes in status may indicate a need to assess USG program intervention. Indicator will also be useful in program planning to determine priorities for allocation of resources.
Data Source and Reporting Frequency	The CIRI Human Rights Data Project, based on State Dept. Annual Reports and annual data from Amnesty International where needed to supplement; http://esdb.eads.usaidallnet.gov/query/do?_program=/eads/esdb/source&source=CIR
Known Data Limitations	Data originates from internal USG sources rather than third party and therefore its objectivity could be questioned. Data is a broad measure which may fail to reflect improvements in some areas and declines in others. Because it is so broad, attributing change to USG programs is difficult, as many other factors can influence judicial independence. One year preparation time means data for current year not available until the following year.
Baseline Timeframe	2009
Disaggregate(s)	N/A

Indicator	2.1.2-7 Number of Judges and judicial personnel trained with USG Assistance
Definition	Judicial personnel Includes judges, magistrates, prosecutors, advocates, inspectors and court staff. Training refers to all training or education events whether short-term or long-term, in-country or abroad. People attending the same type of training, but on different subjects can be counted twice. Narrative reports should indicate the type of training, who the training is for, level of training, duration of training, what constitutes completion. It is required that trainings follow a documented curriculum with stated objectives and/or expected competencies; all data should be sex-disaggregated; and where possible, training should meet national or international standards.
Linkage to Long-Term Outcome or Impact	Training of judges improves their ability to more effectively carry out their duties which improves the capacity of the judiciary to act as a check on government power. Training may also instill a sense of the value of and necessity for judicial independence, transparency and accountability in a democratic society.
Indicator Type	Output
Unit of Measure	Number of judges and judicial personnel
Use of Indicator	This data indicates level of effort and can be assessed in comparison to number of officials that need training to determine coverage. Planners can use to help identify needs, and determine allocation of resources.
Data Source and Reporting Frequency	Annual review of project/program documents to determine the number of activities funded by the USG that aimed to train judges and judicial personnel and the number of individuals reached through attendance sheets and on-site observations by USG officials.
Known Data Limitations	This indicator does not distinguish between short-, medium-, or long-term training. Data does not indicate effectiveness; this indicator will not show which judges or personnel can implement the objectives of the training and does not capture the quality or impact of the training. This indicator also groups together the training of persons across many different functional roles that vary in terms of their power/influence, which could mask gender and other disparities.
Baseline Timeframe	This is an existing indicator, so the baseline will be the year the country began collecting this data.
Disaggregate(s)	Sex; ethnicity where relevant

Indicator	2.1.2-2 Number of laws, regulations and procedures designed to enhance judicial independence supported with USG assistance
Definition	Law refers to written statutes that are official and have been passed in accordance with the country's legal requirements. Regulations and procedures refer to the subsidiary rules, procedures, administrative codes etc. established pursuant to laws by governmental authorities or agencies. Judicial independence is generally used to mean that both the institution of the judiciary and individual judges are free from interference by other institutions and individuals. Operating Units must list the laws supported in the indicator narrative of their past performance reports and in the data reference sheet of their performance management plans.
Linkage to Long-Term Outcome or Impact	Laws lay out the legal basis for building judicial independence and provide one significant indicator of government commitment. Regulations and procedures are the way in which laws are implemented in formal legal systems, and may be equally important in gauging actual improved outcomes. The legal framework for an independent judiciary increases the likelihood that there is commitment for such a system.
Indicator Type	Output
Unit of Measure	Number of national or sub-national laws, regulations and procedures defining judicial independence
Use of Indicator	Indicates level of effort by the USG and the host-country government. Indicator can be used in program-planning and analysis to determine current legal environment with regards to the independence of the judiciary.
Data Source and Reporting Frequency	Annual review of project/program documents, official government journals and documents, public gazettes or public registers, relevant legislative committees, news media, USAID Missions, implementing partners, State Department annual human rights reports, or civil society organizations and international organizations and NGOs tracking these issues, such as, UN High Commissions for Human Rights, Human Rights Watch, and Amnesty International.
Known Data Limitations	The number of laws fails to differentiate quality of the laws.
Baseline Timeframe	This is an existing indicator, so the baseline will be the year the country began collecting this data.
Disaggregate(s)	N/A

2.1.3 – Justice System

Indicator	2.1.3-13 Number of USG-assisted courts with improved case management systems
Definition	Improved is defined as a case management system that has reduced the number of days required for a case to be dealt with by the appropriate actor within the system, whether it be going to trial or otherwise disposed of. Types of functional areas within case management systems include: controlling forms; establishing record control; case processing and record updating; scheduling case events; controlling and storing final records; and reporting management information.
Linkage to Long-Term Outcome or Impact	Without reliable data, courts cannot deliver timely justice, control or monitor their own operations, or explain their operations to citizens. The lack of information on court operations makes citizens suspicious about the fairness, transparency, and integrity of the rule of law. Closed, secretive justice systems create the perception and often the reality of favoritism, malfeasance, and denial of basic rights. Thus, the introduction of high-quality court management information systems affects not only efficiency, but also effectiveness. It can have a significant impact on central ROL issues, such as human rights, access to justice, transparency, and development of democratic institutions and society. USG assistance for an improved case management system will lead to confidence in the judicial system which leads to increased confidence in the government; It can also increase confidence in the economic environment.
Indicator Type	Outcome
Unit of Measure	Number of USG-assisted courts
Use of Indicator	The number of improved case management systems could provide information useful in project planning because it indicates the capacity of a given court system. It is also useful in reporting purposes to show level of effort to improve case management systems.
Data Source and Reporting Frequency	Annual review of project/program documents, official government journals and documents, court and judicial records, USAID Missions, State Department's INL program/project documents, and implementing partners.
Known Data Limitations	
Baseline Timeframe	This is an existing indicator, so the baseline will be the year the country began collecting this data.
Disaggregate(s)	N/A

Indicator	2.1.3-16 Number of individuals/groups from low income or marginalized communities who received legal aid or victim's assistance with USG support
Definition	Areas of low income is defined as those where 60% of the population has an income in the lowest quintile of the country as a whole. Marginalized communities are those who have traditionally been excluded from power and access to resources, and may include indigenous peoples, tribal peoples, other minorities, LGBT populations, women and girls, youth, individuals with disabilities, or other similar groups.
Linkage to Long-Term Outcome or Impact	Local availability of legal aid or victim's assistance for low income or marginalized communities indicates some degree of effectiveness in providing access to justice, a key component of rule of law and human rights. When low income and marginalized groups can access justice it helps improve the legitimacy of the justice system as a whole because individuals can depend on the justice system to seek relief.
Indicator Type	Output
Unit of Measure	Number of individuals or groups. Operating Units should determine and explicitly identify whether the data collected will specify the number of individuals assisted and/or the specific marginalized groups assisted. The Operating Unit should determine this based on the country context.
Use of Indicator	This data indicates level of effort and when compared to number of individuals or marginalized groups that do not receive legal assistance will be useful in program planning and allocation of resources. An increase in the number of individuals or marginalized groups receiving legal assistance suggests USG support is improving access to justice and potentially increasing government legitimacy because marginalized and low-income groups are adjudicating claims under the rule of law.
Data Source and Reporting Frequency	Annual review of implementing partners project/program documents which should indicate number of people or marginalized groups assisted, if allowed. Operating Unit should determine the implementing partners level of detail and reporting frequency based on country context.
Known Data Limitations	This indicator relies on beneficiaries' self-identification which could be inaccurate as disclosing income or specific marginalized status is sensitive. Disaggregation may only be possible and reliable by sex. Legal aid and victim's assistance may be provided by NGOs and other civil society groups rather than the host-country government. While it may provide information about the legal operating environment for such organizations, it may not provide information about government support for access to justice.
Baseline Timeframe	2011 or 2012 as this is a new indicator
Disaggregate(s)	Sex; age; community identification; vulnerable populations; ethnicity; geographic areas where applicable.

Indicator	2.1.3-17 Number of USG-assisted campaigns and programs to enhance public understanding, NGO support and media coverage of judicial independence and accountability.
Definition	Campaigns include all organized outreach activities intended to build support for the particular cause, relying, for example, on electronic media, print media, public meetings, plays etc Operating Units should list and define campaigns and programs in terms of their duration, scale and coverage in the PMP data reference sheet and in the indicator narrative of the PPR.
Linkage to Long-Term Outcome or Impact	Public NGO and media understanding & support are essential for meaningful & long term viability of judicial and other dispute resolution systems. Indicator measures activity of USG partners in conducting outreach activities to achieve such support.
Indicator Type	Output
Unit of Measure	Number of campaigns and programs
Use of Indicator	This number indicates level of effort and will be useful in program planning, reporting, and allocation of resources. An increase in the number of campaigns and programs to enhance public understanding, NGO support and media coverage on judicial independence and accountability suggests that USG support increases public understanding for the need for an independent and accountable judiciary which increases the checks and balances in a government and can decrease corruption and therefore improve economic growth overtime.
Data Source and Reporting Frequency	Annual review of project/program documents, official government journals, and news media.
Known Data Limitations	
Baseline Timeframe	This is an existing indicator, so the baseline will be the year the Embassy or USAID Mission began collecting this data.
Disaggregate(s)	N/A

2.1.4 – Human Rights

Indicator	2.1.4-3 Number of domestic NGOs engaged in monitoring or advocacy work on human rights receiving USG support
Definition	To be counted, the NGO should focus a primary or significant portion of work that addresses strengthening human rights (e.g., in providing services, reporting, advocacy, outreach, education or protection of citizens). In order to make this indicator a meaningful measure, operating units should qualify this indicator in their narrative if possible, (i.e., by noting what types of human rights work, etc.) based on the country, or operating context. USG support includes training, grants or other support designed to improve the human rights services, reporting, and advocacy for the citizens. The types of trainings measured are provided assistance as a result of USG programs, whether short-term or long-term, in-country or abroad, provided with USG assistance. People attending the same type of training, but on different subjects can be counted twice. Narrative reports should indicate the type of training, who the training is for, level of training, duration of training, what constitutes completion. It is required that trainings follow a documented curriculum with stated objectives and/or expected competencies; all data be sex-disaggregated; and that where possible, training meets national or international standards.
Linkage to Long-Term Outcome or Impact	Indicator measures the output of USG assistance aimed at strengthening NGOs working on human rights issues. Supporting domestic NGOs engaged in monitoring or advocacy work will increase the level of transparency and accountability and contribute to the protection of human rights.
Indicator Type	Output
Unit of Measure	Number of NGOs
Use of Indicator	Data indicates level of effort and can be used by Bureaus, missions, and in-country program managers for program planning, adjustment, and resource allocation. An increase in the number of NGOs that engage in monitoring or advocacy with USG support increases the probability that the government is accountable for human rights violations thus decreasing human rights violations because of increased transparency and accountability. A decrease in the number suggests that the government may not be accountable for human rights violations and therefore these violations could remain stagnant or increase.
Data Source and Reporting Frequency	Annual review of project/program documents from implementers and direct USG officials' observations. Given the data-limitations noted below, operating units should detail in their PMP data reference sheets the data collection and calculation method used, along with the efforts being taken.
Known Data Limitations	The number of NGOs does not necessarily give an approximate number of individuals trained or working in the area of human rights. It may also not provide information about the size, ethnic and gender composition of the organization. Other information such as the types of support and training may not be consistent when comparing the data, for example trainings may be long-term, short-term, and/or may cover different topics.

Baseline Timeframe	Baseline needs to be established.
Disaggregate(s)	N/A

Indicator	2.1.4-6 Number of USG supported national human rights commissions and other independent state institutions charged by law with protecting and promoting human rights that actively pursue allegations of human rights abuses during the year
Definition	To be counted, the commission or institution: • Must have the authority to investigate and adjudicate human rights violations; • Must be funded by the government; • Must be actively investigating cases. Actively means that paid staff are interviewing witnesses, documenting evidence, writing reports, etc. Operating Unit should clearly define a particular time period (year- i.e. calendar year/fiscal year etc.) to calculate the data on human rights commissions.
Linkage to Long-Term Outcome or Impact	This indicator highlights acceptance by the government of the private right to file complaints in domestic institutions against governmental abuses, and allow and pay for full investigations. This acceptance shows a willingness for government accountability and transparency to the public on human rights issues. This accountability can also strengthen the legitimacy of the government.
Indicator Type	Output
Unit of Measure	Number of Commissions or Institutions
Use of Indicator	Bureaus, missions, and in-country program managers will use the data for program planning, resource allocation and adjustment. For reporting purposes, the indicator shows level of effort. An increase in the number of USG supported Human Rights Commissions actively pursuing allegations of human rights abuses suggest the probability that USG support is allowing for more government accountability and transparency which will decrease human rights violations. A decrease in the number of USG supported Human Rights Commissions actively pursuing allegations of human rights abuses suggests that the lack of USG support could allow for less government accountability and transparency which could result in more human rights abuses.
Data Source and Reporting Frequency	Annual review of implementing partners' project/program documents, official government journals, news media, and on-site observation by USG officials.
Known Data Limitations	The reliability of information may be inconsistent or low, especially if only asking about investigations because the investigations may not be adjudicated depending on other factors. The number of human rights commissions being supported does not provide specific information about the types of cases being investigated and the beneficiaries of the assistance (for example, detailing the commissions pursuance of certain cases on behalf of particular individuals or groups.) While the commission has authority to investigate cases there may be restrictions on the type of cases that can be investigated and adjudicated. Additionally, the number of cases being pursued may vary for various reasons.
Baseline Timeframe	This is an existing indicator, so the baseline will be the year the country began collecting this data.

Disaggregate(s)	N/A
-----------------	-----

Indicator	2.1.4-7 Number of human rights defenders trained and supported
Definition	To be a human rights defender, a person can act to address any human right (or rights) on behalf of individuals or groups. Human rights defenders seek the promotion and protection of civil and political rights as well as the promotion, protection and realization of economic, social and cultural rights, including rights related to the protection of the environment. USG support includes training, grants or other support designed to improve the human rights services, reporting, and advocacy for the citizens. The types of trainings measured are provided assistance as a result of USG programs, whether short-term or long-term, in-country or abroad, provided with USG assistance. People attending the same type of training, but on different subjects can be counted twice. Narrative reports should indicate the type of training, who the training is for, level of training, duration of training, what constitutes completion. It is required that trainings follow a documented curriculum with stated objectives and/or expected competencies; all data should be sex-disaggregated; and where possible, training should meet national or international standards.
Linkage to Long-Term Outcome or Impact	Human rights defenders are on the frontlines of human rights protection. They are a key aspect to government accountability and contribute to transparency in terms of violations of human rights standards. To the extent human rights defenders are trained and supported to improve their abilities to report and advocate on behalf of human rights, rights will be more easily respected and ensured.
Indicator Type	Output
Unit of Measure	Number of Human Rights Defenders
Use of Indicator	This data indicates the level of effort used to train and bureaus, missions, and in-country program managers will use the data for program planning, adjustment and resource allocation. An increase in the number of human rights defenders trained and supported suggests that USG assistance is providing human rights defenders with an increased capability to report and advocate about human rights violations and the protection of human rights which leads to increased government accountability and transparency because the public is made aware of government violations. This awareness can potentially lead to a decrease in human rights violations.
Data Source and Reporting Frequency	Direct observation from post and implementing partners. Operating Units should determine whether implementing partners should use training registration sheets and/or attendance sheets. This will depend on country context and the need to protect human rights defenders in-country.
Known Data Limitations	Slightly lower reliability because reporting will come from multiple sources
Baseline Timeframe	Baseline needs to be established
Disaggregate(s)	Sex

2.2 – Good Governance

Indicator	2.2-2 Government Effectiveness Index Score
Definition	Government effectiveness is defined as the quality of public services, the quality of the civil service and the degree of its independence from political pressures, the quality of policy formulation and implementation, and the credibility of the government's commitment to such policies. This is a composite indicator, which includes surveys of perceptions, leading to some degree of subjectivity. http://info.worldbank.org/governance/wgi/pdf/ge.pdf
Linkage to Long-Term Outcome or Impact	This indicator attempts to capture the general effectiveness of public institutions, which are both fundamental and essential to the long-term socio-economic development of partner states. An improvement in the perception of public services, civil service performance, the policy-making process and its execution tends to indicate a positive trajectory in the state's development and an improved ability to steward its own resources, or those of donors.
Indicator Type	Outcome
Unit of Measure	The composite measures of governance are in units of a standard normal distribution, with mean zero, standard deviation of one, and running from approximately -2.5 to 2.5, with higher values corresponding to better governance. http://info.worldbank.org/governance/wgi/resources.htm
Use of Indicator	This indicator is intended to inform a broad range of stakeholders about general trends, most likely to be used for planning and budgeting of assistance.
Data Source and Reporting Frequency	World Bank http://info.worldbank.org/governance/wgi/resources.htm ; Annual Reporting Frequency .
Known Data Limitations	This aggregate indicator broadly captures government effectiveness, so it is difficult to attribute changes in the score directly to U.S. assistance. U.S. contribution to changes in the score is more likely. Additionally, Much of the data used in this indicator is subjective, based on perceptions of survey respondents, non-governmental organizations, commercial business information providers and public sector organizations worldwide. The data is updated annually, though there may be a time lag between updates, making it difficult to reference on an annual basis.
Baseline Timeframe	Historical data is available for this indicator.
Disaggregate(s)	None

2.2.1 Legislative Functions and Processes

Indicator	2.2.1-3 Number of draft laws subject to substantive amendment and final vote in legislatures receiving USG assistance
Definition	Draft laws include any proposed enactment formally introduced into the legislature. Substantive amendment means approved changes in the draft law that are policy-based rather than technical in nature. A final vote indicates draft legislation has been passed or rejected. USG assistance to legislatures is defined as activities (such skill development of legislators/staff or infrastructure improvement) aimed at the following: • Building support for democratic reform within a legislature, • Increasing representation of citizens; • Improving technical capacity in policy and lawmaking, • Enhancing oversight of the executive branch, • Ensuring sound management and adequate infrastructure. Operating Units should list the laws supported, as well as those that underwent substantive amendment and a final vote in the indicator narrative of their PPR and in the data reference sheet of their PMP.
Linkage to Long-Term Outcome or Impact	A democratically elected legislature increases public accountability by providing executive branch oversight, improves responsiveness by representing the interests of constituents, and increases participation by providing a forum for citizen engagement. Legislatures function in a democratic manner when they meet regularly and actively to review, debate, amend and vote upon legislation.
Indicator Type	Output
Unit of Measure	Number of draft laws (higher is better)
Use of Indicator	To demonstrate improvements in legislative performance; indicative of the need for or effectiveness of USG assistance.
Data Source and Reporting Frequency	Legislative tracking system or other type of public legislative record-keeping system. Annual reporting frequency.
Known Data Limitations	In some instances there may not be legislative tracking systems.
Baseline Timeframe	This is an existing indicator; historical data exists.
Disaggregate(s)	None

Indicator	2.2.1-7 Number of USG-assisted civil society organizations that participate in legislative proceedings and/or engage in advocacy with national legislature and its committees
Definition	To be counted measures CSOs' active participation in, or engagement with the legislature; for example, attend and contribute to committee meetings, send policy briefs, send comments on proposed legislation, provide research etc. Measures both civil society advocacy efforts with legislatures and legislative outreach and openness to civil society engagement. Operating Units should define participation or advocacy in terms of the scale/scope in their PMP data reference sheet and in the indicator narrative of the PPR.
Linkage to Long-Term Outcome or Impact	This measure captures more than one democracy and governance outcome. It implies CSOs have or will have the capacity to substantively participate in democratic policymaking and that legislators are open to public participation and actively engage in it. Taken together, civil society participation in democratic policymaking improves the transparency and accountability of the legislative process.
Indicator Type	Output
Unit of Measure	Number of CSOs (higher is better)
Use of Indicator	To demonstrate improvements in legislative openness and transparency and increased CSO engagement with, or participation in, legislative processes; indicative of the need for or effectiveness of USG assistance.
Data Source and Reporting Frequency	Reports of committee proceedings augmented by implementing partner audits; Annual Reporting Frequency.
Known Data Limitations	Data integrity: Insufficient committee reporting.
Baseline Timeframe	This is an existing indicator; historical data exists.
Disaggregate(s)	None

Indicator	2.2.1-4 Number of executive oversight actions taken by legislature receiving USG assistance
Definition	Executive oversight actions include legislative committee investigations, public hearings, formal question and answer sessions, and written interrogatories regarding an executive branch program, decision or action. Operating Units should list the oversight actions taken in their PMP data reference sheet and in the indicator narrative of their PPR. Operating units should also specify the type of assistance being provided to facilitate executive oversight actions.
Linkage to Long-Term Outcome or Impact	Oversight actions by the legislature signify efforts by the legislature to hold the executive branch accountable: a key function of democratic legislatures and a key component of a system of democratic checks and balances.
Indicator Type	Output
Unit of Measure	Number of oversight actions by legislature (higher is better)
Use of Indicator	To demonstrate increase in executive oversight actions by the legislature; indicative of the need for or effectiveness of USG assistance.
Data Source and Reporting Frequency	Legislative record. Annual reporting frequency.
Known Data Limitations	Possible issues of availability or precision. The quality, accuracy and detail of legislative records vary.
Baseline Timeframe	This is an existing indicator; historical data exists.
Disaggregate(s)	None

Indicator	2.2.1-6 Number of public forums resulting from USG assistance in which national legislators and members of the public interact
Definition	Public forums are defined as public hearings and town hall meetings. Operating Units should define the scale or scope of public forums in their PMP data reference sheet and in their PPR indicator narrative.
Linkage to Long-Term Outcome or Impact	Extensive interaction between legislators and members of the public is an important component of effective representation, which is a key function of democratic legislatures. When extensive interaction between legislators and the public results in more effective representation, government decision-making may be considered more transparent and accountable.
Indicator Type	Output
Unit of Measure	Number of public forums (Higher = better)
Use of Indicator	To demonstrate improvements in legislative representation; indicative of the need for or effectiveness of USG assistance.
Data Source and Reporting Frequency	Legislative record. Annual reporting Frequency.
Known Data Limitations	Possible issues of availability or precision. The quality, accuracy and detail of legislative records vary.
Baseline Timeframe	This is an existing indicator; historical data exists.
Disaggregate(s)	None

2.2.2 Public Sector Executive Function

Indicator	2.2.2-6 Number of training days provided to executive branch personnel with USG assistance
Definition	Training is defined as in-service technical training in the areas of administration, management/leadership or good governance practices for civil servants or public employees working for the executive branch or its line ministries. Training refers to all skill- or knowledge-building efforts that follow a documented curriculum with stated learning objectives and/or expected competencies for the trainees. Training may be short- or long-term, in-country or abroad. One training day is defined as no less than six hours of training.
Linkage to Long-Term Outcome or Impact	The executive branch is generally tasked with executing the many routine tasks of the state, including managing service delivery and enforcing the nation's laws. The civil servants and public employees who work in the executive are therefore critical to the effective and responsive management of the state. Building the skill-base of executive branch staff can therefore positively impact the overall effectiveness of state performance.
Indicator Type	Output
Unit of Measure	Number of days (higher is better)
Use of Indicator	Reporting and accountability of funds spent; capturing the number of training days for executive staff will enable program managers to assess the degree to which USG resources are being used to strengthen executive branch management capacity and balance that investment with oversight functions or investment in other governance areas.
Data Source and Reporting Frequency	A documented training curriculum (including schedule) and signed attendance sheets will serve as the data source. Reporting frequency should be quarterly.
Known Data Limitations	The number of training days provides a better sense of the depth of training being provided though it doesn't capture how many individuals are being engaged.
Baseline Timeframe	Baseline needs to be established.
Disaggregate(s)	Sex

2.2.3 Local Government and Decentralization

Indicator	2.2.3-2 Number of laws or amendments to laws promoting decentralization drafted with USG assistance
Definition	Included in this indicator are laws and amendments to laws intended for debate and decision by the national legislature. Promoting means advancing, favoring, enhancing, enabling decentralization. There is no threshold to the magnitude of change proposed. Examples: Laws increasing the ability of local governments to raise own-source revenues; laws enabling elected local governments; laws that devolve powers from national government entities to regional, local or municipal entities; or laws establishing merit-based civil service status for local government employees. Operating Units should list the laws or amendments in their PPR indicator narrative and in the data reference sheet of their PMP.
Linkage to Long-Term Outcome or Impact	Within a unitary state, national laws or amendments to national laws that devolve powers from national government entities to sub-national entities define the actions and authorities of sub-national governments. In a federal system, laws or amendments to laws defining sub-national governments may be either national laws or the laws of sub-national intermediate jurisdictions. In either case, long-term impact is achieved through adherence to or enforcement of the law. Decentralization favors good governance by making local leaders accountable and responsive to local electorates. Local decision-making by elected and appointed public authorities is likely to be more transparent to local electorates than national decision-making. Furthermore, the existence of elected local governments greatly increases the opportunities for citizens to serve as public officials, enhancing their understanding of good governance.
Indicator Type	Output
Unit of Measure	Number of laws and amendments
Use of Indicator	Indicator can reflect willingness of partner governments to decentralize, which may impact current program planning or future assistance efforts.
Data Source and Reporting Frequency	National or subnational laws defining decentralization is the data source; reported annually.
Known Data Limitations	Laws on the books may not be observed in practice
Baseline Timeframe	This is an existing indicator; historical data exists.
Disaggregate(s)	None

Indicator	2.2.3-5 Number of sub-national entities receiving USG assistance that improve their performance
Definition	Sub-national entities refer to government units administratively responsible for a specific sub-area within the nation's territory, including their departments and divisions. Sub-national entities may be at the regional, state/provincial, district/county or municipal level. "Improved performance" is measured by an increase in quantity, increase in quality (as measured and/or as perceived by end users), and decreased unit cost of provision of service. Services on which they might be working to improve performance will vary by country, but may include water, electricity, waste management, public sanitation, public health, public security, regulation and operation of public markets, street or road maintenance, planning and regulation of land use. USG assistance efforts not only aim to improve the quality and quantity of select services, but to impart rational management approaches to ensure their long-term viability. Operating units should define the services targeted for improved performance, the type of improvement targeted, and the specific entities receiving assistance in the indicator reference sheet and performance narrative.
Linkage to Long-Term Outcome or Impact	The service delivery role of local governments in decentralized states is fundamental to their legitimacy and a key enabling factor for development. The quality, quantity and unit cost of services are fundamental measures of local government performance and public response to decentralization. This indicator captures USG assistance to these entities. It is critical to not only focus on the perceived quality and quantity, but on rational management of resources (as understood through the unit cost of provision) in order to ensure the long-term sustainability of the service delivery.
Indicator Type	Output (high-level)
Unit of Measure	Number of entities
Use of Indicator	A change in the performance of subnational entities will help program managers understand the impact of assistance programs, determine the suitability for other assistance programs and learn from effective approaches.
Data Source and Reporting Frequency	This will vary by service and by country, though an example might be electricity provision. A public survey might provide perceptions on the quality of service, supported by utility documentation on the number and duration of outages. Utility records might document the overall supply provided (in kilowatts). Finally, utility expenditure records can inform the unit cost. Each Operating Unit should define collection plans in PMP data reference sheet and in the indicator narrative of the PPR. Reporting frequency may vary.
Known Data Limitations	Data related to the unit cost of service provision will depend on partner government disclosures and may be hard to verify. Additionally, perceptions of public service quality do not always match actual service quality, as perceptions of service delivery are often influenced by one's

	level of approval of public officials.
Baseline Timeframe	Needs to be established.
Disaggregate(s)	None

Indicator	2.2.3-8 Percentage of local governments audited on an annual basis as reported by the central government auditing body
Definition	Numerator: Number of local governments audited as reported by the national auditing body Denominator: Total number of local government entities as reported by the national auditing body. Local governments refer to subnational entities administratively responsible for a specific subarea within the nation's territory, including their departments and divisions. Sub-national entities may be at the state, regional, district or municipal level. Audits refer to independent performance and/or financial reviews of local governments conducted by an authorized public or accredited private auditing body. The percentage of local governments audited is more valuable than the number, given that the overall number of sub-national entities tends to change frequently (and therefore will need to be continually verified).
Linkage to Long-Term Outcome or Impact	The auditing of sub-national entities reflects an interest in independent performance review and the existence of intra-governmental oversight mechanisms. The extent to which the central government's auditing body is involved in or inventorying these reviews also reflects the overall relationship between national and sub-national entities. While decentralization has many merits such as improving responsiveness, fostering greater accountability and creating competition among sub-national entities to meet citizen preferences, the existence of vertical accountability, or the accountability of sub-national entities to national government structures, provides a further check on local government performance and an incentive to reduce waste and corruption.
Indicator Type	Output
Use of Indicator	Reporting and accountability of funds spent; increased vertical accountability may inform budget planning and program strategy
Data Source and Reporting Frequency	National central auditing body. The specific data source will vary by country and should be noted in the performance management plan indicator reference sheets. Frequency may vary.
Known Data Limitations	The central government may have political incentives for manipulating the data. This might be mitigated by periodic or random verification that sub-national entities have received audits and that the findings were transmitted to the central auditing body.
Baseline Timeframe	This is an existing indicator; historical data exists.
Disaggregate(s)	Numerator, Denominator

Indicator	2.2.3-9 Percent of local elected councils and and/or mayorships undergoing turnover in political party control from one election to the next.
Definition	Numerator: Number of local councils in which the majority party changed and individual mayors changed regardless of party affiliation. Denominator: Total number of local councils and individual mayorships Local government elections are defined as official electoral processes used to select and replace members of local councils and mayors. The term 'local councils' refers to elected bodies that have authority over subnational administrative divisions within the nation's territory. Sub-national entities at the state, regional, district, city or municipal level may be included in this definition. Competitiveness is measured by the percentage turnover in political party control of elected councils (simple majority) and/or mayors from one election to the next. (Higher turnover = more competition.) Operating Units should specify what local government entities are receiving USG assistance, and what type of assistance, in their PMP reference sheet and PPR narrative.
Linkage to Long-Term Outcome or Impact	Competitive elections at the local level reflect political accountability of local officials to the general public. While political accountability itself is not a guarantee of improved public sector performance, it does create more incentives for better governance as well as provide the opportunity for local citizens to replace those who fail to meet expectations. USG assistance activities that promote improved local government accountability, greater public transparency, increased political party activity and greater citizen participation all contribute to increasing local competition.
Indicator Type	Output
Unit of Measure	Percent
Use of Indicator	IA change in the level of political competitiveness at the local level may reflect the impact of USG assistance efforts and can inform current and future assistance programming.
Data Source and Reporting Frequency	Election records maintained by the relevant central election body will serve as the primary source. The local elections schedule will determine the reporting frequency.
Known Data Limitations	Depending on the frequency of local elections, this indicator may not be able to support short- or even medium-term reporting.
Baseline Timeframe	Baseline needs to be established.
Disaggregate(s)	Numerator, Denominator

2.2.4 Anti-Corruption

Indicator	2.2.4-8 Corruption Perception Index Score
Definition	The Corruption Perceptions Index (CPI) is an aggregate indicator that brings together data from sources that cover the past two years. The CPI is calculated using data from a number of sources by independent institutions. All sources measure the overall extent of corruption (frequency and/or size of bribes) in the public and political sectors, and all sources provide a ranking of countries, i.e. include an assessment of multiple countries.
Linkage to Long-Term Outcome or Impact	The prevalence of corruption undermines development in a variety of ways: by eroding public confidence in state officials, squandering scarce resources, distorting or stifling competition, and discouraging investment, among other reasons. Petty corruption (lower level, administrative corruption) creates bureaucratic disincentives for increasing transparency, undermines accountability and responsiveness, and generally fosters more leakage and waste, undermining public sector effectiveness.
Indicator Type	Outcome
Unit of Measure	Score on the Corruption Perception Index (CPI). The CPI is an aggregate indicator that brings together independent sources to measure the extent of corruption (frequency and/or size of bribes). Multiple sources are used in each country (in 2010, 13 sources were available from 10 institutions, from country experts, both residents and non-residents, and business leaders). The scale is 0 to 10, with 0 being the lowest possible score and 10 the highest. The methodology for each CPI differs each year. For 2010's CPI methodology, see http://www.transparency.org/policy_research/surveys_indices/cpi/2010/in_detail#4 .
Use of Indicator	This indicator is intended to inform a broad range of stakeholders about general trends, most likely to be used for planning and budgeting of assistance, rather than for monitoring or evaluation.
Data Source and Reporting Frequency	Transparency International, annual http://www.transparency.org/policy_research/surveys_indices/cpi
Known Data Limitations	The indicator captures meta-level results, so it is difficult to attribute changes in the score directly to U.S. assistance. U.S. contribution to changes in the score is more likely. Much of the data used in this indicator is subjective, based on perceptions rather than objective data.
Baseline Timeframe	Historical data is available for this indicator
Disaggregate(s)	None

Indicator	2.2.4-2 Number of government officials receiving USG-supported anti-corruption training
Definition	Training is defined as in-service technical training for civil servants and other public sector employees. Anti-corruption training for government officials is defined as skill or knowledge transfer intended to reduce corruption or leakage in public administration (for example public financial management or ethics training). The training must follow a documented curriculum with stated learning objectives and/or expected competencies for the trainees.. Operating Units should define training completion standards in their PMP data reference sheet and in the indicator narrative of the PPR. For example, for short course completion, full attendance may be mandatory. For longer courses, pre- and post-training testing may be used to ensure competency was achieved.
Linkage to Long-Term Outcome or Impact	Government employees are critical to public administration. While systems can be designed to reduce incentives and opportunities for corruption and provide checks and safeguards against waste, fraud and abuse, individuals must have the skills to manage those systems and processes, and be aware of the ethical norms related to their roles.
Indicator Type	Output
Unit of Measure	Number of individuals
Use of Indicator	Helps identify USG's human capital investment to combat corruption and can inform the need to increase or decrease assistance in that area
Data Source and Reporting Frequency	Detailed course curriculum and attendance sheets; annual.
Known Data Limitations	Attendance sheets and curriculum do not indicate knowledge transfer. Also, the number of individuals trained does not account for differences in quality or length of training provided.
Baseline Timeframe	This is an existing indicator; historical data exists.
Disaggregate(s)	Sex

Indicator	2.2.4-5 Number of people affiliated with non-governmental organizations receiving USG-supported anti-corruption training
Definition	Training is defined as in-service technical training for individuals affiliated with non-governmental organizations. Anti-corruption training is defined as skill or knowledge transfer intended to reduce corruption or leakage in public administration (for example public expenditure tracking or ethics training). The training must follow a documented curriculum with stated learning objectives and/or expected competencies for the trainees. Operating Units should define training completion standards in their PMP data reference sheet and in the indicator narrative of the PPR. For example, for short course completion, full attendance may be mandatory. For longer courses, pre- and post-training testing may be used to ensure competency was achieved.
Linkage to Long-Term Outcome or Impact	Non-state actors play in key role in discovering fraud, waste or abuse in public administration. While public systems can provide checks and safeguards against waste, fraud and abuse, individuals outside of government can deter corruption by monitoring performance and serving in a watchdog role. In order to perform that function, individuals affiliated with non-governmental organizations must have the skills and understanding of public financial management to be able to uncover abuse and use it effectively to hold public officials accountable.
Indicator Type	Output
Unit of Measure	Number of individuals
Use of Indicator	Helps identify USG's human capital investment to combat corruption and can inform the need to increase or decrease assistance in that area
Data Source and Reporting Frequency	Detailed course curriculum and attendance sheets; annual.
Known Data Limitations	Attendance sheets and curriculum do not indicate knowledge transfer. Also, the number of individuals trained does not account for differences in quality or length of training provided.
Baseline Timeframe	This is an existing indicator; historical data exists.
Disaggregate(s)	Sex

Indicator	2.2.4-7 Number of USG-supported anti-corruption measures implemented
Definition	Anticorruption measures may include enforcement mechanisms for new laws, regulations and procedures; consultative mechanisms; oversight mechanisms; investigative/prosecutorial initiatives; public information initiatives; and other measures taken (in any sector) with the objective of increasing transparency about public decision making, conflict of interest, resource allocation, etc.; decreasing impunity for corrupt acts; increasing demand for reform or awareness of the problem; increasing knowledge about corruption and its costs; and reducing opportunities for corruption. In order to count a measure as “implemented”, all of the following must be true: the measure has been publicly committed to by a government or non-governmental organization; a strategy, charter and/or operational plan exists; financial and human resources are allocated; and outputs detailed in the strategy, charter or operational plan are observable to third-parties Operating Units should list and define the anticorruption measures implemented in the indicator narrative of their PPR and in the data reference sheet of their PMP.
Linkage to Long-Term Outcome or Impact	The existence of formal and informal anti-corruption mechanisms, both inside and outside of government, are necessary to actually account for the use of public resources in an effort to reduce fraud, waste and leakage and increase the effectiveness of public sector management. Without mechanisms to enforce existing laws, advocate for new laws, provide oversight of public administration, perform watchdog functions and provide information on public performance to citizens, it is likely that scarce development resources will be squandered and mismanaged.
Indicator Type	Outcome
Unit of Measure	Number of anti-corruption measures implemented
Use of Indicator	Reporting and accountability of funds spent; indicates government and non-government commitment to reducing corruption; informs planning and budgeting for broader USG assistance
Data Source and Reporting Frequency	Copies of charters, strategies and/or operating plans from each governmental or non-governmental organization expressing commitment to the measure; annual.
Known Data Limitations	Precision: the broad definition of “anticorruption measures” makes this difficult to capture consistently. Furthermore, the existence of strategies, operating plans and charters alone does not necessarily reflect implementation.
Baseline Timeframe	This is an existing indicator; historical data exists.
Disaggregate(s)	None.

2.3 – Political Competition and Consensus Building

Indicator	2.3-3 Freedom in the World Score for <i>Free, Partly Free</i> or <i>Not Free</i>
Definition	Freedom in the World is an annual survey produced by Freedom House that uses a standard methodology to assess the state of political freedom in every country in the world. Each country is ranked as <i>Free, Partly Free</i> or <i>Not Free</i> . This status is determined by aggregating the separate scores given for “Political Rights” and “Civil Liberties”, each of which is graded from 1 to 7. Additional information is available at www.freedomhouse.org . Changes in status indicate increasing or decreasing democracy. A determination is also made as to whether or not the country is an <i>Electoral Democracy</i> . Changes in status indicate movement in a positive or negative direction
Linkage to Long-Term Outcome or Impact	This is a very broad indicator of political change in a country. In countries receiving substantial USG democracy assistance expectations would be improvement in freedom over time or maintenance of a particular level in an environment characterized by negative influences.
Indicator Type	High-level outcome or impact
Unit of Measure	Status as Free, Party Free, or Not Free, with the score of <i>Free</i> recorded as (1), <i>Partly Free</i> as (2), and <i>Not Free</i> as (3). Scores can be averaged across countries to show regional trends over time; or as percent of countries in each category; or as number of countries in each category.
Use of Indicator	Changes in status indicate positive or negative impact and may inform USG program interventions and assumptions. Achievement of ranking of <i>Free</i> and <i>Electoral Democracy</i> (next indicator) is an indication that democracy assistance may no longer be required. Improvements in ranking in countries receiving USG assistance can be used as a broad indicator of the impact of USG democracy assistance.
Data Source and Reporting Frequency	Freedom House, Freedom in the World index. Annual. The total score awarded to the political rights and civil liberties checklist determines the political rights and civil liberties rating. Each rating of 1 through 7, with 1 representing the highest and 7 the lowest level of freedom corresponds to a range of total scores. Each pair of political rights and civil liberties ratings is averaged to determine an overall status of "Free," "Partly Free," or "Not Free." Those whose ratings average 1.0 to 2.5 are considered Free, 3.0 to 5.0 Partly Free, and 5.5 to 7.0 Not Free (see http://www.freedomhouse.org/template.cfm?page=351&ana_page=363&year=2010).
Known Data Limitations	Very broad measure that by averaging a number of variables may fail to reflect improvements in some areas and declines in others. It tracks progress in all Program Areas of Governing Justly and Democratically, not just 2.3 Political Competition and Consensus Building. Because it is so broad, attributing change to USG programs is difficult, as many other factors can influence political development at this level. One year preparation time means data for current year not available until following year. Positive sub-indicators may suggest USG <i>contribution</i> rather than <i>attribution</i> .
Baseline Timeframe	Historical data is available for this indicator
Disaggregate(s)	None

Indicator	2.3-4 Status as Electoral Democracy, based on Freedom House rating
Definition	Enter 1 for 'Yes, the country is an Electoral Democracy' Enter 0 for 'No, the country is not an Electoral Democracy' Freedom House conducts an annual survey that uses a standard methodology to rate every country in the world as an "electoral Democracy" or 'Not an Electoral Democracy'. Additional information is available at www.freedomhouse.org. Changes in status indicate increasing or decreasing democracy.
Linkage to Long-Term Outcome or Impact	This is a very broad indicator of political change in a country. In countries receiving substantial USG democracy assistance expectations would be advancement to 'improvement in freedom over time or maintenance of a particular level in an environment characterized by negative influences.
Indicator Type	High-level outcome or impact
Unit of Measure	Electoral Democracy = (1), Not Electoral Democracy = (0)
Use of Indicator	Changes in status indicate positive or negative impact and may inform USG program interventions and assumptions. Achievement of ranking of <i>Free</i> (the previous indicator) and <i>Electoral Democracy</i> is an indication that democracy assistance may no longer be required. Improvements in ranking in countries receiving USG assistance can be used as broad indicators of the impact of USG democracy assistance. Scores on the survey can be averaged across countries to show regional trends over time; or as percent of countries in each category; or as number of countries in each category.
Data Source and Reporting Frequency	Freedom House, Freedom in the World index. Annually reported.
Known Data Limitations	Very broad measure that by averaging a number of variables may fail to reflect improvements in some areas and declines in others. Because it is so broad, attributing change to USG programs is difficult, as many other factors can influence status as 'Electoral Democracy'. One year preparation time means data for current year not available until following year.
Baseline Timeframe	Historical data is available for this indicator
Disaggregate(s)	

2.3.1 – Consensus-Building Policies

Indicator	2.3.1-4 Number of USG-assisted consensus-building processes resulting in an agreement
Definition	Consensus-building processes include: national, sub-national, and local dialogues, as well as referenda, and peace processes. Agreement can take the form of interim or final plans of action, constitutions, constitutional amendments, draft legislation, legislation on electoral frameworks issues, statutes, regulations, or peace agreements. Operating units should list the agreements in the data narrative of the PPR and in the data reference sheet in their PMP, along with the form of consensus-building process leading to the agreement.
Linkage to Long-Term Outcome or Impact	Consensus-building processes increase the likelihood that parties will reach agreement. Over the long-term, consensus-building will result in an increase in mutual understanding and a decrease in societal conflict and instability, contributing to the development of a consensual, deliberative and participatory culture of democracy.
Indicator Type	Outcome
Unit of Measure	Number of agreements reached with USG assistance
Use of Indicator	This indicator will suggest level of effort and effectiveness in consensus-building. Planners and analysts can compare agreements reached to the total number of processes supported to get an indication of increasing or decreasing consensus in society, and may adjust program plans and allocate resources accordingly. The sum of agreements facilitated worldwide with USG assistance can be used in reporting to demonstrate the positive impact of DG assistance.
Data Source and Reporting Frequency	Annual review of program reports to determine the number of consensus-building processes supported with USG assistance that resulted in agreements. Confirm the support was provided through review of attendance sheets and on-site observation by USG officials during the program year. Independently confirm that the agreements were reached through annual review of relevant official government journals or proclamations, and news media reports.
Known Data Limitations	Uncontrolled variables make direct attribution of such agreements to USG assistance difficult, but facilitation of processes that lead to agreements implies contribution. Also, the data for this indicator does not capture the relative significance of individual agreements reached by consensus.
Baseline Timeframe	This is an existing indicator, so the baseline will be the year the country began collecting this data.
Disaggregate(s)	None

Indicator	2.3.1-6 Number of groups trained in conflict mediation/resolution skills or consensus-building techniques with USG assistance
Definition	"Groups" are entities (e.g. NGOs, government, political parties, civil society organizations, unions, employers, factions, media, or ethnic or marginalized groups) involved in, or planning to be involved in, conflict mediation or consensus-building processes. Training can be for any amount of time at a USG sponsored event, workshop or seminar. People attending the same type of training but on different subjects can be counted twice. Narrative reports should indicate the type of training (pre-service, in-service), who the training is for (community health worker, to upgrade a medical assistant to a nurse), level of training (basic, elementary, technical, university/certification), duration of training, what constitutes completion (for a short course, full attendance may be mandatory; for a longer course, there might be testing to ensure competencies are achieved; for certification, there may be a graduation). It is required that training follow a documented curriculum with stated objectives and/or expected competencies; all data be sex-disaggregated; and that where possible, training meets national or international standards.
Linkage to Long-Term Outcome or Impact	Training groups in conflict mediation/resolution skills or consensus building techniques will increase the possibility that consensus-building processes will result in an agreement. Contributes to peaceful agreement on democratic reform, rules, and frameworks.
Indicator Type	Output
Unit of Measure	Number of groups that have received training
Use of Indicator	This data indicates level of effort and when compared at post to "number of groups that need training" will be useful for program planning and allocation of resources.
Data Source and Reporting Frequency	Annual review of project/program documents to determine the number of activities funded by the USG that aimed to train groups in conflict mediation skills or consensus building techniques, and the number of groups reached through such activities. Confirm the activities were conducted and number of groups reached through attendance sheets and on-site observation by USG officials.
Known Data Limitations	The number of groups does not directly indicate the number of people trained.
Baseline Timeframe	This is an aggregation of two existing indicators, so the baseline will be the sum of the previous indicators (2.3.1-2 & 2.3.1-3) the year the country began collecting this data.
Disaggregate(s)	None.

Indicator	2.3.1-7 Number of consensus building forums (multi-party, civil/security sector, and/or civil /political) held with USG Assistance
Definition	Multi-party, civil/military, civil /political forums are events, seminars, meetings, and conferences that bring together groups in tension or conflict in an effort to generate greater understanding and consensus. Civil in this sense means “public” and indicates a meeting, town hall, forum, etc. in which the public can communicate directly with representatives of parties (or government) or the security sector (military, police). For purposes of this indicator, a series of regularly-recurring meetings/events that are part of the same process are counted as one event: e.g. a series of municipal government hearings to get feedback on a three-year development plan should be counted as one event.
Linkage to Long-Term Outcome or Impact	Increased communication between groups in conflict or tension will enhance understanding and increase the possibility that consensus-building processes will result in an agreement. Contributes to peaceful agreement on democratic reform, rules, and frameworks.
Indicator Type	Output
Unit of Measure	Number of forums
Use of Indicator	This data indicates level of effort. If there is a perceived need for consensus-building forums and this is a low number, then programmers might increase the number of consensus building forums they produce.
Data Source and Reporting Frequency	Annual review of project/program documents to determine the number of forums funded or assisted by the USG. Confirm the activities were conducted and number of groups reached through attendance sheets and on-site observation by USG officials.
Known Data Limitations	N/A
Baseline Timeframe	Baseline needs to be established (Some missions that have been programming in this area, but not reporting the information to Washington may be able to identify a historical baseline from existing program documents.).
Disaggregate(s)	None required. Post may wish to disaggregate by type for local planning and evaluation.

2.3.2 – Elections and Political Processes

Indicator	2.3.2-13 <i>Freedom in the World</i> Political Rights sub-score for electoral process
Definition	“Electoral process” is a sub-element of the Political Rights component of Freedom House’s <i>Freedom in the World</i> survey. The three main questions used to determine the sub-score for Electoral Process are: • Is the head of government or other chief national authority elected through free and fair elections? • Are the national legislative representatives elected through free and fair elections? • Are the electoral laws and framework fair? Scores for this measure range from a low of 0 to a perfect score of 12.
Linkage to Long-Term Outcome or Impact	This indicator is based on reviews of data and experts’ assessments of different aspects of the election process, and changes in the score will indicate an improving or deteriorating election process. Improvements in elections will contribute to long-term improvement in democratic and representative political processes.
Indicator Type	Outcome/impact
Unit of Measure	A numerical score ranging from 0 to 12 with 12 being best.
Use of Indicator	Changes in score will reflect an improving or deteriorating electoral environment, and help planners determine need and estimate impact. Average improvement in score can demonstrate positive impact of USG assistance, while changes in country scores can be used to determine priorities and better allocate resources. The data from this indicator can be used for both assessing the contribution of USG assistance as well as for planning purposes.
Data Source and Reporting Frequency	Freedom House <i>Freedom in the World</i> index. Annually. Scores for 2011 are available at: http://www.freedomhouse.org/template.cfm?page=635 . The scoring questions are available at: http://www.freedomhouse.org/template.cfm?page=351&ana_page=374&year=2011
Known Data Limitations	This indicator is a broad measure that by averaging a number of variables may fail to reflect improvements in some areas and declines in others. Because other assistance providers’ activities or other external factors can affect election processes, attributing change to USG programs is difficult. Positive indicators may suggest USG <i>contribution</i> . Report preparation takes a year so data is only available for the previous year.
Baseline Timeframe	Historical data is available for this indicator
Disaggregate(s)	None

Indicator	2.3.2-11 Number of domestic election observers and/or party agents trained with USG assistance
Definition	Number trained in preparation for deployment as observers or party agents before or during a national or significant election or referendum. Training can be of any duration and can take the form of a USG-sponsored event, workshop, or seminar. Training can be held in cooperation with implementers of other donors. Narrative reports should indicate the type of training (pre-service, in-service), who the training is for (community health worker, to upgrade a medical assistant to a nurse), level of training (basic, elementary, technical, university/certification), duration of training, what constitutes completion (for a short course, full attendance may be mandatory; for a longer course, there might be testing to ensure competencies are achieved; for certification, there may be a graduation). It is required that training follow a documented curriculum with stated objectives and/or expected competencies; all data be sex-disaggregated; and that where possible, training meets national or international standards.
Linkage to Long-Term Outcome or Impact	Training observers or party agents will increase the transparency of the election process, and contribute to a free, fair and credible election, as well as the development or maintenance of electoral democracy.
Indicator Type	Output
Unit of Measure	Number of observers and agents trained
Use of Indicator	Indicates level of effort, and can be compared to number of observers and agents trained with other resources to estimate USG contribution to a transparent process. Can be disaggregated by observer/agent and compared to number of polling stations to determine percent covered. If less than 100% of polling stations were covered, and post-election there are still doubts about the credibility and transparency of the process, then assistance providers might plan to increase the percentage of stations covered in future elections. If 100% of the stations were covered and the process was still flawed, that would be an indication that assistance was required elsewhere to resolve the problem.
Data Source and Reporting Frequency	Attendance sheets, on-site observation by USG officials and annual review of project/program documents.
Known Data Limitations	N/A
Baseline Timeframe	Baseline needs to be established (Some Missions may have training records for party agents which were not including in PPR reporting to Washington. Where this is the case, it is possible a historical baseline could be identified in combination with election observer training records.)
Disaggregate(s)	Sex, party agent/domestic observer

Indicator	2.3.2-3 Number of election officials trained with USG assistance
Definition	Number of elections officials trained with USG assistance in elections procedures and administration. An election official can be anyone from the highest election official—often a Central Election Commission—as well as regional officials and polling station workers. Training can be of any duration and take the form of a USG sponsored event, workshop or seminar. People attending the same type of training but on different subjects can be counted twice narrative reports should indicate the type of training (pre-service, in-service), who the training is for (community health worker, to upgrade a medical assistant to a nurse), level of training (basic, elementary, technical, university/certification), duration of training, what constitutes completion (for a short course, full attendance may be mandatory; for a longer course, there might be testing to ensure competencies are achieved; for certification, there may be a graduation). It is required that training follow a documented curriculum with stated objectives and/or expected competencies; all data be sex-disaggregated; and that where possible, training meets national or international standards.
Linkage to Long-Term Outcome or Impact	Training election officials is intended to increase their capacity to administer elections effectively, improving the overall quality of election administration. This is expected to increase the credibility and legitimacy of the election process; and contribute to the development or maintenance of electoral democracy.
Indicator Type	Output
Unit of Measure	Number of officials trained
Use of Indicator	Indicates level of effort, and can be assessed in comparison to number of officials that need training (based on the total number of temporary officials hired or deployed to conduct the election) to determine coverage. Planners can use to help identify needs, and determine allocation of resources.
Data Source and Reporting Frequency	Attendance sheets, on-site observation by USG officials and annual review of project/program documents
Known Data Limitations	This indicator does not distinguish between short, medium or long-term training and does not capture the quality or impact of the training.
Baseline Timeframe	This is an existing indicator, so the baseline will be the year each country began collecting this data.
Disaggregate(s)	Sex

Indicator	2.3.2-6 Number of laws or amendments to ensure credible elections drafted with USG technical assistance
Definition	“Laws and amendments to laws” refers to legislation by national legislatures pertaining to elections and/or political parties. They also include regulations of ministries, responsible units of the executive or legislative branches and election management bodies, which have the force of law in elaborating or implementing legislation. “To ensure credible elections” means that the legislation intends to make the electoral processes more competitive, impartial, and efficient. Drafted is defined as “written” rather than enacted and does not refer to several draft versions of the same law. For this indicator, individual laws that are incorporated into a single election code will be counted separately, e. g. amendments to a law on local elections and to a law on election management bodies will be counted as two amendments even though they are ultimately included into a comprehensive election code.
Linkage to Long-Term Outcome or Impact	This indicator demonstrates USG support for improving the legal framework for credible elections. The indicator does not measure the quality of legislation or implementation, but suggests improvements in the electoral process based on assistance provided in drafting/amending legislation. Improving the legal framework for elections will increase the credibility and legitimacy of the election process; and contribute to the development or maintenance of electoral democracy.
Indicator Type	Output
Unit of Measure	Number of laws or amendments drafted with USG assistance
Use of Indicator	Indicates level of effort.
Data Source and Reporting Frequency	Annual review of program reports to determine the number of laws or amendments drafted with USG assistance. Confirm the support was provided through review of attendance sheets and on-site observation by USG officials during the program year. Independently confirm that the laws and amendments were enacted through annual review of relevant official government journals or proclamations, and news media reports.
Known Data Limitations	N/A
Baseline Timeframe	This is an existing indicator, so the baseline will be the year the country began collecting this data.
Disaggregate(s)	None

Indicator	2.3.2-12 Number of individuals receiving voter and civic education through USG-assisted programs
Definition	Any eligible voter that receives voter or civic education messages through print, broadcast, or new media, as well as via in-person contact can be counted. Voter and civic education also includes community-based trainings in underserved areas, public service announcements on electronic media, written materials, internet-based information and messages using the new media (in this usage primarily, but not exclusively social networking sites like Facebook and Twitter). Content may include voter motivation, explanation of the voting process, the functions of the office(s) being contested and descriptions of the significance of the elections in democratic governance. Operating units include in their PMP and PPR a list of the different types of media or other contacts used in their programs, along with the objectives of the voter/civic education programming in their country context. Units should include the locally used definitions for minority and disadvantaged/marginalized groups in their PMP indicator reference sheet and in the PPR.
Linkage to Long-Term Outcome or Impact	The provision of voter and civic education in developing democracies will help ensure that voters have the information they need to be effective participants in the democratic process, contributing to the development or maintenance of electoral democracy.
Indicator Type	Output
Unit of Measure	Individuals reached
Use of Indicator	In-country analysts can use this indicator to inform programming and help identify priorities for allocation of resources. Aggregated worldwide this indicator will help demonstrate the broad reach of USG democracy assistance.
Data Source and Reporting Frequency	Annual review of project/program documents from implementers; voter education activities include estimates of people reached in grant or contract agreement documents. Attendance sheets and independently collected audience estimates can also be used to demonstrate coverage. Given the data limitations noted below, operating units should detail in their PMP data reference sheets the data collection/calculation methodology for each method used, along with efforts being taken to avoid multiple counting.
Known Data Limitations	Aggregates different types of interventions and fails to distinguish the relative impact of different interventions. Potential for multiple counting of the same individual for different messages or by different providers can make estimates of coverage problematic.
Baseline Timeframe	Baseline needs to be established
Disaggregate(s)	Sex, minorities or disadvantaged/marginalized, percent of eligible voters reached through USG assistance

2.3.3 – Political Parties

Indicator	2.3.3-7 Freedom House <i>Freedom in the World</i> Political Rights sub-score for Political Pluralism and Participation
Definition	"Political Pluralism and Participation" is a sub-element of the Political Rights component of Freedom House's <i>Freedom in the World</i> survey. The Political Rights rank is determined by three sub-scores for item B, one of which is sub-score for Political Pluralism and Participation is determined using. The four main guide questions used to determine the sub-score are: • Do the people have the right to organize in different political parties or other competitive political groupings of their choice, and is the system open to the rise and fall of these competing parties or groupings? • Is there a significant opposition vote and a realistic possibility for the opposition to increase its support or gain power through elections? • Are the people's political choices free from domination by the military, foreign powers, totalitarian parties, religious hierarchies, economic oligarchies, or any other powerful group? • Do cultural, ethnic, religious, or other minority groups have full political rights and electoral opportunities? Additional sub-questions are available on the Freedom House website. Scores for this measure range from a low of 0 to a perfect score of 16. Scores for 2011 are available at: http://www.freedomhouse.org/template.cfm?page=635
Linkage to Long-Term Outcome or Impact	Improvements in the representativeness of political parties will contribute to long-term improvement in democratic and representative political processes, as well as improvements in political parties and governments that are accountable to citizens.
Indicator Type	Outcome/Impact
Unit of Measure	A numerical score ranging from 0 to 16 with 16 being best.
Use of Indicator	Changes in score will reflect improving or deteriorating political party environment and party system. Average improvement in score may demonstrate positive impact of USG assistance, while changes in country scores can be used to determine priorities and better allocate resources.
Data Source and Reporting Frequency	Freedom House, Freedom in the World index. Annual. Scores for 2011 are available at: http://www.freedomhouse.org/template.cfm?page=635
Known Data Limitations	A broad measure that by averaging a number of variables may fail to reflect improvements in some areas and declines in others. Because other assistance provider's activities or other external factors can affect the indicator, attributing change to USG programs is difficult. Positive indicators may suggest USG contribution. Data is only available for the previous year.
Baseline Timeframe	Historical data is available for this indicator
Disaggregate(s)	None

Indicator	2.3.3-6 Number of USG-assisted political parties implementing initiatives to increase the number of candidates and/or members who are women, youth and from marginalized groups
Definition	Initiatives must be active and credible (i.e. a specific objective of the initiative with associated activities, rather than a cross-cutting theme) efforts, and make use of financial and/or human resources to reach out and increase numbers of candidates, members of committees and governing boards, and general members who are women, youth (0-30 years old), or from politically marginalized groups. Operating Units should provide a list of the parties and the percent of parties reached in the indicator narrative portion of their PPR and in their PMP data reference sheet. They should also define and list those groups considered marginalized in the specific country context in their PMP indicator reference sheet and in the PPR.
Linkage to Long-Term Outcome or Impact	Increasing the number of women, youth and marginalized groups represented in political parties can improve the quality of representation and contribute over the long term to the consolidation of democracy.
Indicator Type	Output
Unit of Measure	Number of political parties implementing programs
Use of Indicator	This indicator shows level of effort in strengthening the political representation of marginalized groups. Disaggregation by percentage of relevant parties reached will be useful in country in determining addition need for similar programs.
Data Source and Reporting Frequency	Annual review of project/program documents to determine how many parties received USG assistance to implement initiatives to increase the number of candidates and members who are women, youth and from marginalized groups. Attendance sheets to determine whether or not the activities reached the marginalized groups, and on-site observation by USG officials to confirm that the activities took place.
Known Data Limitations	USG officials may not keep adequate records
Baseline Timeframe	This is an existing indicator, so the baseline will be the year the country began collecting this data.
Disaggregate(s)	Type of program: women/youth, marginalized group; percentage of relevant parties implementing initiatives with USG assistance

Indicator	2.3.3-1 Number of individuals who received USG-assisted political party training
Definition	Number of political party representatives, political group (A group organized to pursue political objectives that is not a formal political party. Does not have to be the primary purpose of the group. For example, a trade association would fall under this definition for activities related to achieving a political objective) representatives, and independent candidates who received USG-supported training in political party strengthening (e.g., campaign techniques, membership development, constituency outreach, platform design, communication skills, transparency, fundraising, campaign finance, etc.). Training refers to all training or education events whether short-term or long-term, in-country or abroad. People attending the same type of training but on different subjects can be counted twice narrative reports should indicate the type of training (pre-service, in-service), who the training is for (community health worker, to upgrade a medical assistant to a nurse), level of training (basic, elementary, technical, university/certification), duration of training, what constitutes completion (for a short course, full attendance may be mandatory; for a longer course, there might be testing to ensure competencies are achieved; for certification, there may be a graduation). It is required that training follow a documented curriculum with stated objectives and/or expected competencies; all data be sex-disaggregated; and that where possible, training meets national or international standards.
Linkage to Long-Term Outcome or Impact	Providing training to party members is intended to improve party organization, strengthen internal democracy, increase diversity in the parties, and enhances the parties' capacity to effectively represent the interest of their constituents. Over time, training will contribute to the development and consolidation of democracy.
Indicator Type	Output
Unit of Measure	Number of individuals trained
Use of Indicator	This indicator shows level of effort in strengthening capacity and representativeness of parties. It can be compared in-country to estimates of the total number of people needing training to determine requirements for additional programming.
Data Source and Reporting Frequency	Attendance sheets, on-site observation by USG officials
Known Data Limitations	The training does not distinguish between short- medium-, or long-term training.
Baseline Timeframe	This is an existing indicator, so the baseline will be the year the country began collecting this data. (baseline data may not be available for the disaggregates)
Disaggregate(s)	Sex, Youth (0-30) , politically marginalized group

Indicator	2.3.3-4 Number of political parties and political groupings receiving USG assistance to help them develop more programmatic platforms and policy agendas
Definition	More detailed party platforms and policy agendas provide voters with the information needed to make an informed decision on election day and to make parties and representatives more accountable in government. Programmatic is described as a party-developed campaign that focuses on a detailed program, rather than on personality, ethnicity, religion, etc. USG assistance would be any assistance provided for the purpose of improving platforms and policy agendas, and can include research activities such as conducting and/or interpreting polls and surveys, training and technical assistance. Operating Units should provide a list of the parties reached in the indicator narrative portion of their PPR and in their PMP data reference sheet.
Linkage to Long-Term Outcome or Impact	If a political party or political grouping effectively articulates a platform and a policy agenda, it indicates an orientation toward issue-based development of the political party/grouping/candidacy and toward party professionalism, as well as a step towards open competition of ideas. If more than one significant party, grouping or independent candidate effectively articulates a platform or agenda, it can indicate a step toward greater competition of ideas, underpinning the development or reinforcement of a competitive, democratic political system. Lastly, if parties, groupings, and/or independent candidates make their policy platform and agenda known, citizens can hold them accountable to those platforms, improving the prospects for effective representation and accountability.
Indicator Type	Output
Unit of Measure	Number of parties assisted
Use of Indicator	This indicator shows level of effort in strengthening responsiveness and accountability, and progress towards institutionalization of the party system.
Data Source and Reporting Frequency	Annual review of project/program documents, attendance sheets, on-site observation by USG officials. Annual review of project/program documents to determine how many parties received USG assistance to help them develop more programmatic platforms and policy agendas. On-site observation by USG officials to confirm that the activities took place.
Known Data Limitations	This is an absolute measure and therefore is not always useful for comparison. For example if a country has only three parties and USG provides assistance to them, the score will be three. However, if a country has 10 parties, and we USG provides assistance to 8, the score will be 8.
Baseline Timeframe	This is an existing indicator, so the baseline will be the year the country began collecting this data.
Disaggregate(s)	None

2.4 – Civil Society

Indicator	2.4-5 Composite score of two Civil Liberties subcategories from Freedom House Freedom in the World Index—“Freedom of Expression and Belief” and “Associational and Organizational Rights”
Definition	The two Civil Liberties subcategories used in this indicator are “Freedom of Expression and Belief” and “Associational and Organizational Rights.” The Freedom House checklist questions associated with these subcategories broadly address independent media and cultural expressions, and freedom of assembly and public discussion that highly influence the legal environment in which trade unions, Civil Society Organization (CSOs), and education and religious institutions operate.
Linkage to Long-Term Outcome or Impact	The questions captured under the “Freedom of Expression and Belief” and “Associational and Organizational Rights” sub-categories track key issues related to citizens’ ability to freely associate, advocate, and communicate with each other and their government. The civil liberties checklist assesses areas such as freedom of expression, assembly, association, education, and religion. An improvement in these areas may serve as a proxy for measuring the long-term impact of interventions focused on this program area.
Indicator Type	Outcome
Unit of Measure	Composite score from raw score reported for the “Associational and Organizational Rights” and “Freedom of Expression and Belief” subcategories in the annual Freedom House Freedom in the World Index. The sub-category “Freedom of Expression and Belief” includes four questions with a score range from 0 to 16 representing 4 points for each question. The “Associational and Organizational Rights” sub-category includes three questions with a total score range from 0 to 12. This indicator captures the composite of the raw scores from both sub-categories (score ranging from 0 to 28). A rating of 0 indicates the highest degree of freedom and 28 the least amount of freedom. http://www.freedomhouse.org/template.cfm?page=372
Use of Indicator	Bureaus, missions, and in-country program managers will use this indicator for program planning and adjustment. The composite score of the two Civil Liberties subcategories can help identify trends in the Civil Society Program Area based on the checklist questions pertaining to “Freedom of Expression and Belief” and “Associational and Organizational Rights”. A comparison of the composite scores over time should indicate improvements or reductions in progress in these areas.
Data Source and Reporting Frequency	The Freedom in the World Report is produced annually, covering most if not all countries assisted by the USG.
Known Data Limitations	Attribution challenges – Positive changes in results reflect USG <i>contribution</i> rather than <i>attribution</i> ; the USG is one of many actors that contribute to Development Objective-level changes. Missions will also need to access the raw data, which is now available at http://www.freedomhouse.org/template.cfm?page=276 . There will be a lag in the availability of the data.
Baseline Timeframe	Freedom House began disaggregating the scores for Freedom in the World in 2010 and the baseline for the composite score would be calculated in the FY 2011 PPR.

Disaggregate(s)	None.
-----------------	-------

2.4.1 – Civic Participation

Indicator	2.4.1-10 USAID NGO Sustainability Index - Europe & Eurasia (29 countries), Africa (19 countries), MENA (7 countries)
Definition	The NGO Sustainability Index assesses the state of the NGO sector (the organizational, institutional and environment aspects of participation) in up to 55 countries. The Index measures seven dimensions of sustainability of the civil society sector: Legal Environment, Organizational Capacity, Financial Viability, Advocacy, Service Provision, Civil Society Infrastructure, and Public Image. The assessment is based on observations of the sector's level of sustainability, rather than on a causal theory of development. The seven dimensions are clustered into three categories of sustainability of the civil society sector: Sustainability Enhanced, Sustainability Evolving, and Sustainability Impeded. Sustainability Enhanced, the highest level of sustainability, corresponds to a score between 1 and 3 points; Sustainability Evolving corresponds to a score between 3 and 5 points; and Sustainability Impeded corresponds to a score of 5 to 7 points on the scale. *See the following link for a more detailed description of and scoring for each dimension: http://www.usaid.gov/our_work/democracy_and_governance/technical_areas/civil_society/angosi/
Linkage to Long-Term Outcome or Impact	Because the NGO Sustainability Index assesses the state of the NGO sector (the organizational, institutional and environment aspects of civic participation), it is an appropriate meta-indicator measuring changes in the state of the NGO sector's sustainability over time.
Indicator Type	Outcome
Unit of Measure	Scored from 1-7. 7 being low/poor level of sustainability, 1 being very advanced. The NGO Sustainability Index provides an overall "NGO sustainability" score, by country. Comparable to Freedom House scoring methodology.
Use of Indicator	Bureaus, missions, and in-country program managers will use the data for program planning and adjustment. A comparison of the NGO Sustainability Index over time should indicate improvements or reductions in progress in this program area.
Data Source and Reporting Frequency	NGO Sustainability Index is published annually, with the report usually issued in April for the previous year.
Known Data Limitations	Attribution challenges – Positive changes in results reflect USG <i>contribution</i> rather than <i>attribution</i>; the USG is one of many actors that contribute to Development Objective-level changes. Geographic Limitations – as mentioned above, only certain countries and regions are covered by the NGO Sustainability Index.
Baseline Timeframe	Data from 2009 and 2010 for Sub-Saharan Africa Data from 2000 for Europe & Eurasia (from 1998 for some countries) Data from 2011 for Middle East and North Africa
Disaggregate(s)	The seven dimensions of NGO sustainability are: legal environment, organizational capacity, financial viability, advocacy, service provision, infrastructure, and public image.

Indicator	2.4.1-9 Number of Civil Society Organizations (CSOs) receiving USG assistance engaged in advocacy interventions.
Definition	CSOs in USG programs that initiate or participate in advocacy interventions. Advocacy should be understood as a means for individuals, constituencies, or organizations to shape public agendas, change public policies, and influence other processes that impact their lives. Advocacy does not involve one march, meeting or poster, but a series of strategic, interconnected, integrated activities designed to achieve a goal. It may include a wide range of activities, such as, lobbying, public interest litigation, letter writing campaigns, civil disobedience, etc. Advocacy interventions tend to: • Be strategic (a deliberate, planned action, not random); • Involve a set of actions that are sustained in order to build and direct pressure; • Be designed to persuade; • Be targeted; • Involve alliance building. Successful advocacy efforts result in change. Operating Units should specify the type of advocacy interventions in their PMP data reference sheet and use the PPR indicator narrative to describe the impact, scale/scope of the advocacy interventions.
Linkage to Long-Term Outcome or Impact	Advocacy interventions are essential aspects of democratic policy making, citizen participation, and oversight of all branches of government. These interventions play an important role in determining social justice, political and civil liberties, and in giving voice to citizens and historically marginalized groups. At its best, advocacy expresses the power of an individual, constituency, or organization to shape public agendas and change public policies. As part of a broader civil society strategy, advocacy-oriented action goes beyond specific objectives (e.g., raising the minimum wage) to providing the means to mobilize society, ideas, and resources in an effort to bring about democratic change and/or its consolidation. It is a critical means for citizens to express their needs and concerns to government.
Indicator Type	Output
Unit of Measure	Number of CSOs
Use of Indicator	Bureaus, missions, and in-country program managers will use the data for program planning. This indicator sheds light on the extent to which Missions are working with civil society to assist them in having a voice in public decision-making and other political processes. Missions could use this indicator to report on how they are supporting local civil society. This would be relevant for the Agency's USAID Forward reforms which include a component on strengthening civil society capacity to advance aid effectiveness. This is the only indicator that captures policy advocacy as a critical civil society function.
Data Source and Reporting Frequency	Data source will be defined by the operating unit, and may include such sources as local partners' advocacy plans or strategies, implementation plans, recording of press conference, copy of testimony or press release,

	advocacy campaign materials, etc.
Known Data Limitations	Slightly lower reliability because reporting will come from multiple sources
Baseline Timeframe	Baseline from 2011 data of the indicator “Number of Civil Society Organizations receiving USG Assistance engaged in advocacy and watchdog functions.”
Disaggregate(s)	None

Indicator	2.4.1-4 Number of independent, democratic trade/labor unions supported by USG to promote international core labor standards
Definition	An independent, democratic union is defined as: being autonomous of government, run/managed based on internally democratic procedures and seeks to promote (i.e., advocate for, support) international, core labor standards; freedom of association; and collective bargaining. All three of these characteristics are important for a union to be considered independent and democratic. It is recognized, however, that many programs working toward fulfilling this objective are attempting to assist unions in strengthening their capacity to be independent and democratically governed. These three characteristics must be present for a union to be considered independent and democratic.
Linkage to Long-Term Outcome or Impact	Democratic unions are one of the primary stakeholder groups that are likely to mobilize constituencies and are critical for promoting international core labor standards. As one of the principal membership organizations in many societies, they have the capacity to reach a large number of people in order to advocate for change and influence government and other stakeholders. If democratically governed, they also can serve as incubators of democratic processes (i.e., free and fair elections) and values (i.e., transparency, accountability, participation, and representation).
Indicator Type	Output
Unit of Measure	Number of unions
Use of Indicator	This indicator has two major uses: first, it captures the amount of USG funding provided to democratic unions, which allows reporting on USAID's congressional earmark for global labor programming. Second, it can help indicate the number of unions active in a particular country.
Data Source and Reporting Frequency	Data source will be defined by the operating unit, and may include data collected from organizational capacity development assessments, partner implementation plans and other program documents.
Known Data Limitations	Slightly lower reliability because reporting will come from multiple sources
Baseline Timeframe	PPR data reporting on number of unions supported in FY 2011.
Disaggregate(s)	None

Indicator	2.4.1-11 Number of USG-funded organizations representing marginalized constituencies trying to affect government policy or conducting government oversight
Definition	Number of USG-funded organizations that have marginalized groups (including ethnic minority, religious minority, disabled, and Lesbian/Gay/Bisexual/Transgender populations) as constituents and represent the views and interests of these groups through policy advocacy (i.e., efforts to enable an individual, constituency, or organization to shape public agendas and change public policies) and government monitoring and oversight (i.e., overseeing the implementation of public policy, monitoring and reviewing budgets, etc.) activities. The definition of 'marginalized' must be determined at the Operating Unit level. The organizations may be active in any development sector (i.e., health, education, democracy and governance, environment, education, etc.)
Linkage to Long-Term Outcome or Impact	Marginalized groups generally are least able to exercise their fundamental human rights and freedoms. This indicator emphasizes the importance of supporting organizations that serve as advocates for these populations so their voice is also heard by policy makers. The long-term goal is that all citizens are able to freely associate, advocate and communicate with their governments and each other, not only those who belong to the majority.
Indicator Type	Output
Unit of Measure	Number of organizations that represent marginalized populations.
Use of Indicator	Bureaus, missions, and in-country program managers will use the data for program planning and adjustment. It is important to ensure that marginalized populations are engaged in USAID programs. This indicator will help Missions track the extent to which that is the case. It can also be used to track broader trends in supporting marginalized groups (i.e., for congressional inquiries).
Data Source and Reporting Frequency	Data sources will be defined by the operating unit, and may include sources such as membership registries for USAID partner organizations, interviews with marginalized constituent groups, lists of beneficiaries, press releases on relevant topics, recordings of public hearings on relevant topics, etc.
Known Data Limitations	Would need to be supplemented with interviews with or surveys of marginalized constituents to determine the extent to which the organization actually represents the target constituent group's concerns.
Baseline Timeframe	Will need a new baseline for FY 2012
Disaggregate(s)	Sex, Ethnic groups, Religious groups, Sexual orientation, Disability

2.4.2 – Media Freedom and Freedom of Information

Indicator	2.4.2-9 Score on the Freedom of the Press Index
Definition	An annual index produced by Freedom House that uses a standard methodology to assess the state of media freedoms in 196 countries throughout the world. Each country media system is analyzed under three basic categories (legal, political and economic environments), scored on a 0-100 scale, and ranked as <i>Free (0-30 points)</i> , <i>Partly Free (31-60 points)</i> or <i>Not Free (61-100 points)</i> . Methodology involves a total of 109 sub-indicators, used to answer 23 main questions, which taken together explore a quite full range of factors for enabling press freedoms. Index methodology encompasses a comprehensive range of factors influencing media freedoms, thereby providing a meaningful first order estimate of the general press conditions in each country.
Linkage to Long-Term Outcome or Impact	Media Freedom and Freedom of Information depend on a variety of factors, including the legal, political, and economic environments, to enable the free flow of information needed by citizens in a democratic system. These enabling factors for free media are measured, evaluated, and summarily analyzed by the Freedom House Freedom of the Press Index.
Indicator Type	Outcome
Unit of Measure	Numerical score from 0-100, with 0 being the best score and 100 the worst. Country media systems are ranked as <i>Free (0-30 points)</i> , <i>Partly Free (31-60 points)</i> or <i>Not Free (61-100 points)</i> .
Use of Indicator	Used by USAID, U.S. State Department, the World Bank, the academic community, and many others to broadly track positive or negative trends in the levels of press freedoms permitted in up to 196 countries. The Freedom House index provides useful baseline data on sectoral conditions, also usefully tracking year-to-year positive or negative trends.
Data Source and Reporting Frequency	Freedom House: Freedom of the Press Index. Annual http://www.freedomhouse.org/template.cfm?page=16
Known Data Limitations	Freedom House methodology addresses neither the professional level of journalism nor media business management capacities, both representing important factors for assessing the quality of press freedom in a media system. Media freedom involves many complex factors, so positive indicators may suggest USG <i>contribution</i> rather than <i>attribution</i> . Further, given the complexity of variables influencing media freedoms, and the small size of most media assistance programs relative to the larger media sector environments, one might anticipate at best small, time-lagged positive correlations between USG media assistance and improvements in the measured levels of press freedoms.
Baseline Timeframe	Annual results since 1990 (and posted at www.freedomhouse.org since 2002)
Disaggregate(s)	Three sub-categories of analysis of press freedoms: Respectively, for the legal (0-30 points), political (0-40 points), and economic (and 0-30 points) enabling environments for free (r) media. The three sub-categories are summed for each country for a combined country score of 0-100 points. The disaggregated sub-categories of index analysis are sometimes useful for identifying more specific media sector improvements and declines.

Indicator	2.4.2-10 Rating on IREX Media Sustainability Index
Definition	An annual index produced by IREX (International Research and Exchanges Board) that uses a standard, detailed methodology to assess the quality and sustainability of independent media in up to 80 countries. MSI assesses five objectives regarding the legal enabling environment, level of journalistic professionalism, degree of pluralism, business and management practices, and supporting institutions for self-sustained, independent media. Each objective is analyzed in terms of 7-9 more detailed sub-indicators. Scoring is performed in two parts: first by a panel of a dozen or more local experts drawn from the country's media professionals and observers; followed by a review performed by IREX editorial staff.
Linkage to Long-Term Outcome or Impact	Index methodology encompasses a detailed, comprehensive range of factors influencing the level and sustainability of media freedoms, thereby providing a meaningful first order estimate of the general media and free expression conditions in each country.
Indicator Type	Outcome
Unit of Measure	Scoring system ranges as follows: (0-1) unsustainable, anti-free press; (1-2) unsustainable mixed system; (2-3) near sustainability; and (3-4) sustainable.
Use of Indicator	Used by USAID, U.S. State Department, the World Bank, the academic community, and many others to for detailed tracking of positive or negative trends in the levels of press freedoms permitted in up 80 countries in Eurasia, Middle East, and Africa. The Index provides useful baseline data on sectoral conditions, also usefully tracking year-to-year positive or negative trends. This index considerably assists USAID to conduct media sector assessments, to identify media sector strengths and weaknesses, to design media assistance programs to assist weakly rated mass communications systems, either generally or in targeted areas of weakness. Indicator also provides useful baseline and basic trends data, for purposes of analyzing program results year-to-year and/or from program inception to end.
Data Source and Reporting Frequency	International Research and Exchanges Board (IREX) Media Sustainability Index (www.irex.org) Annual
Known Data Limitations	Does not cover Asia or Latin America. Also, media freedom involves many complex factors, so positive indicators may suggest USG <i>contribution</i> rather than <i>attribution</i> . Given the complexity of variables influencing media freedoms, and the small size of most media assistance programs relative to the larger media sector environments, one might anticipate at best small, time-lagged positive correlations between USG sectoral assistance and improvements in the measured levels of media freedoms.
Baseline Timeframe	Annual data since 2001 for Europe/ Eurasia (currently 22 countries); since 2005 for Middle East and North Africa (18 countries); and since 2006 for Africa (40 countries)
Disaggregate(s)	Index disaggregates data to additional score five sub-objectives, including: • Legal and social norms protect and promote free speech and access to public information; • Journalism meets professional standards of quality; • Multiple news sources provide citizens with reliable, objective

	news; • Independent media are well-managed businesses, allowing editorial independence; • Supporting institutions function in the professional interests of independent media. These scores are available both individually; and as a combined or composite score.
--	--

Indicator	2.4.2-8 Number of training days provided to journalists with USG assistance, measured by person-days of training.
Definition	Training refers to all training or education events whether short-term or long-term, in-country or abroad. It includes pre-service and in-service training for journalists, editors, and related production staff for news and public information media. The level of training includes basic, technical, university, and mid-career, certificated training. One training day is defined as no less than six hours of training per day.
Linkage to Long-Term Outcome or Impact	Trained journalists are essential to a responsible and professional press, enabling media outlets to produce higher quality news and public affairs contents covering a broader range of issues with verified information that can help citizens make informed decisions in public life. Indicator provides a basic measure of the output of USG programs to train journalists with the applied skills and knowledge needed to produce professional news and information contents for media outlets. In turn, more professional media contents contribute to better informed citizens, transparency, and stronger Fourth Estate checks on government officials.
Indicator Type	Output
Unit of Measure	Number of days (higher is better)
Use of Indicator	USAID and U.S. State Department as a proxy measure for level of effort to create a more responsible and professional press corps.
Data Source and Reporting Frequency	Data source(s) will be specified by the operating unit, but may include such sources as training registration or attendance sheets, university journalism schools, mid-career media training institutes, professional journalists' associations, etc. Annual or semi-annual.
Known Data Limitations	N/A
Baseline Timeframe	New indicator, so baseline will begin in 2011.
Disaggregate(s)	Sex

Indicator	2.4.2-11 Number of USG-assisted Media-Sector Civil Society Organizations (CSO) and/or Institutions that serve to strengthen the independent media or journalists
Definition	To qualify CSOs and institutions must endeavor to defend free media rights, provide professional journalism or media training, lobby on behalf of independent media sector interests, and/or otherwise serve to strengthen the functioning of independent media and/or journalists as at least one substantive component of their mission or agenda. Examples include: journalists unions, media industry associations, mid-career journalist training centers, university journalism schools, press councils, media rights monitoring groups, or any CSO which serves to strengthen or support the independent media and/or journalists as part of its mission.
Linkage to Long-Term Outcome or Impact	Media-sector CSOs protect freedom of the press and expression, raise the professional quality of journalism, lobby for independent media industry interests, and/or otherwise strengthen the functioning of the independent media, thereby bolstering the media's Fourth Estate checking functions, better informing all democratic processes, and contributing to transparency.
Indicator Type	Output
Unit of Measure	Number of CSOs and support institutions
Use of Indicator	Used by USAID and U.S. Department of State as a proxy measure for level of effort, and diversity of media sector approaches. A larger number of supported media-sector CSO suggests a more comprehensive approach and a broader array of assistance activities in this sector.
Data Source and Reporting Frequency	Data source(s) will be specified by the operating unit, but typically includes reporting by the implementing partners. Annual or semi-annual.
Known Data Limitations	Indicator does not provide information regarding the funding level, specific types of activities implemented, or results achieved.
Baseline Timeframe	This is an existing indicator, so the baseline will be the year the country began collecting this data.
Disaggregate(s)	N/A

Indicator	2.4.2-5 Number of non-state news outlets assisted by USG
Definition	Non-state-controlled news outlets include privately-owned, community, or independent public service media outlets. Types of platforms include: television, radio, print or Internet media outlets that produce news and public affairs related contents.
Linkage to Long-Term Outcome or Impact	Indicator measures USG activity aimed at strengthening independent sources of professional and objective news and information through USG assistance such as training, grants or other support designed to improve the quantity and quality of professional and objective news available to the public.
Indicator Type	Output
Unit of Measure	Number of news outlets
Use of Indicator	Proxy for level of effort by USAID and U.S. Department of State to support the development of independent media.
Data Source and Reporting Frequency	Missions will work with their implementing partners to collect and report this information at least on an annual basis.
Known Data Limitations	Does not measure the funding level or type of supported activities, so media outlets counted will range from those receiving very small as well as very large levels of support. Also, as the number of trained, technically assisted, or supported bloggers, social media, citizen reporters, and other small media actors multiply, it becomes increasingly difficult to count the number of “news outlets” assisted, and the size of assisted outlets includes a diverse set of actors (from single-person operations to media houses employing hundreds of staff).
Baseline Timeframe	This is an existing indicator, so the baseline will be the year the country began collecting this data.
Disaggregate(s)	N/A